Environment-Assisted Quantum State Restoration Via Weak Measurement

Kelvin Wang[1,2],* Xinyu Zhao[1], and Ting Yu[1]
[1] *Center for Controlled Quantum Systems and the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, New Jersey 07030, USA. and*
[2] *Academy for the Advancement of Science Technology at Bergen County Academies, Hackensack, New Jersey, 07601, USA.*
(Dated: April 17, 2014)

In this paper, a new quantum state restoration scheme is proposed based on the environment-assisted error correction (EAEC) scheme. By introducing a weak measurement reversal (WMR) operation, we shall show how to recover an initial state of a quantum open system without invoking random unitary decompositions which are known to be absent in many important physical systems. We illustrate our new scheme and compare it with a scheme purely based on the WMR operation in the case of dissipative channel. In the proposed new scheme, the successful probability of recovering an unknown initial state can be significantly improved when the information obtained from an environment measurement is taken into account. Moreover, we show that the applicable range of our proposed scheme is wider than the EAEC scheme. Finally, the optimization of the successful probability for possible Kraus decompositions is discussed.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Pp, 03.65.Yz

arXiv:1404.4110v1 [quant-ph] 15 Apr 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Decoherence is a major obstacle in effectively implementing a quantum information processing task due to the inevitable interactions between quantum systems and their environments [1–8]. In the past few decades, several theoretical schemes, including dynamic decoupling control [9], feedback control [10], error correction codes [11], weak measurement reversal (WMR) [12, 13] and environment-assisted error correction (EAEC) [14, 15], to name a few, have been proposed to protect a quantum state from environmental noises. The EAEC scheme originally proposed by Gregoratti and Werner [14] has been studied in several interesting contexts [15–24]. The underlying crucial idea in the EAEC scheme is to restore an unknown quantum state coupled to a noisy environment by performing a measurement on the environment followed by a quantum restoration operation on the system of interest conditioned on environment measurement outputs. Essentially, if the non-unitary evolution of a quantum open system can be randomly decomposed into many unitary quantum processes, then the initial state can be recovered for each particular realization. It should be noted that, in the original Gregoratti-Werner scheme, in order to restore the initial system state, only one reversal operation conditioned on the outcome of a measurement performed on the environment is needed. In addition, it is shown that the successful probability is always 1, and the fidelity of the recovered state is also always 1. While the EAEC scheme is clearly of interest in quantum decoherence control and quantum state restoration, its application is restricted due to the nonexistence of the required random unitary (RU) decomposition for many realistic physical models. A recent attempt in relaxing the RU limitation is to use a non-RU decomposition to recover some entangled states in a dephasing channel [25]. However, a general scheme dealing with an arbitrary unknown state and a noisy channel that does not allow an RU decompositions is still an open question.

The dynamics of a quantum open system, represented by a reduced density operator $\rho(t)$, can be formally described by a Kraus decomposition [3, 26–28], where $\rho(t) = \sum_n K_n(t)\rho(0)K_n^\dagger(t)$. The crucial point of implementing the EAEC scheme is that all the Kraus operators K_n must be proportional to unitary operators, i.e., $K_n = c_n U_n$. If this is satisfied, then these K_n operators are said to be a random unitary (RU) decomposition. If a Kraus operator K_n is not an RU type, the Gregoratti-Werner scheme cannot be used to recover an arbitrary initial state as the reversal quantum operations are not available in this case. We shall show, however, that combing environment measurement and weak measurement [12, 13] can yield a useful technique to restore a quantum state in a dissipative channel. Unlike the RU decomposition, the successful probability of the new scheme cannot be 1. We shall consider a case where K_n is not promotional to unitary matrix, but still a non-singular matrix. In this case, as shown later, by using weak measurement described by a positive-operator valued measure (POVM). it is still possible to find a reversal operation to restore the post-measurement state $K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger$. As a result, the new scheme we propose here is no longer a deterministic process. However, the advantage of this new scheme is its wider range of applications and the high fidelity of the recovering operations.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we shall briefly review the EAEC scheme. Then, we propose a new version of the EAEC scheme with the aide of weak measurement reversal operations in Sec. III. In order to illustrate the new scheme, we analyze carefully a two-qubit dissipative model and compare the results with the WMR scheme in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, we discuss how the Kraus decomposition affects the successful probability of

* kelvinwang42@gmail.com

the newly proposed scheme. Finally, a conclusion and the future perspective are given in Sec. VI.

II. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENT-ASSISTED ERROR CORRECTION SCHEME

The dynamics of an open quantum system may be established from the quantum dynamics describing the total system (system plus environment), which is governed by the Schrödinger equation. The evolution for the reduced density matrix of the system of interest can be obtained by tracing over the environmental degrees of freedom $\rho(t) = \mathrm{tr}_E[\rho_{\mathrm{tot}}(t)]$, and it can be formally written in the Kraus (operator sum) representation [3, 26–28],

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(t) &= \textstyle\sum_n \langle\psi_n|U|0\rangle\rho(0)\langle 0|U^\dagger|\psi_n\rangle \\ &= \textstyle\sum_n K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger,\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $K_n = \langle\psi_n|U|0\rangle$ are the zero-temperatrue ($T = 0$) Kraus operators, which depend on the initial state of the environment and the choice of the complete basis of the environment $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$.

The EAEC scheme is based on the idea that the environment will collapse into an eigenstate of the measured observable if a measurement on the environment is performed. Correspondingly, after the measurement is performed, the system will be projected into a state relative to each resulting environmental state. More specifically, if the n^{th} outcome in the environment measurement is observed then the system will be in the state represented by $\rho_n(t) = K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger$ (up to a normalization factor). Thus, the EAEC scheme is implementable if the Kraus decomposition is random unitary (RU), i.e., $K_n = c_nU_n$ for each n, where $U_n^\dagger = U_n^{-1}$ and c_n satisfy $\sum_n |c_n|^2 = 1$. The initial quantum state can then be recovered by applying a quantum reversal operation,

$$\rho_R(t) = R_n\rho_n(t)R_n^\dagger = \rho(0), \tag{2}$$

where $R_n = \frac{1}{c_n}U_n^{-1}$. It is clear that if there exists an RU decomposition, the fidelity and probability of realizing restoration are always one. But it should be noted that that the desired RU decomposition is not always available. For example, the RU decomposition does not exist for a dissipative channel.

Therefore, it is of interest to extend the original EAEC to a probabilistic quantum reversal scheme where the RU decomposition is not required. We shall show in what follows that, for some open systems, the non-unitary quantum evolution may be reversed by a quantum weak measurement reversal (WMR) operation [12, 13]. The quantum weak measurement can be represented by a set of generalized measurement operators $\{M_m\}$ satisfying

$$\sum_m M_mM_m^\dagger = I. \tag{3}$$

All of these operators $M_mM_m^\dagger$ must be positive semidefinite, so that it is called positive-operator valued measure (POVM). When a POVM type measurement is performed, the post-measurement state becomes

$$\rho' = \frac{M_m\rho M_m^\dagger}{\mathrm{tr}(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)}, \tag{4}$$

assuming that the m^{th} outcome is observed in the weak measurement. When the measurement operators are chosen as a complete set of orthogonal projectors, $M_mM_m^\dagger = |\phi_m\rangle\langle\phi_m|$, the generalized POVM reduces to a projective (strong) measurement.

The weak measurement can be implemented in many different ways depending on the concrete physical systems. For example, in an optical system, the qubit states are encoded by the polarization of light. Using a Brewster-angle glass plate [13], the vertical (or horizontal) polarization component is partially blocked. In another example, by introducing an auxiliary qubit, the weak measurement on the system qubit can be achieved through a strong (projective) measurement on the auxiliary qubit with some necessary quantum gate operations [12].

In the next section, we will show that an unknown initial state may be restored using a probabilistic weak measurement restoration operation even if the Kraus operators are not in an RU form.

III. ENVIRONMENT-ASSISTED ERROR CORRECTION WITH WEAK MEASUREMENT REVERSAL

Our proposed scheme is a combination of a weak measurement operation and a measurement on the environment. In this new scheme, we only need to assume that some of the Kraus operators K_n in the decomposition Eq. (1) are invertible instead of unitary. That is, the inverse operator K_n^{-1} exists, which is denoted as $R_n = K_n^{-1}$. Then, it is straightforward to check the following operation will recover the initial states

$$R_nK_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger R_n^\dagger = \rho(0). \tag{5}$$

However, when R_n is not a unitary quantum operation, the implementation of the reversal quantum operation is not straightforward. Actually, such an R_n (unnormalized) operation can be realized through a weak measurement. Suppose that there is only one invertible K_n operator in the decomposition Eq. (1), the case involving more than one invertible K_n can be treated in a similar way. Without loss of generality, we can always choose $R_n = K_n^{-1}$ (which is invertible) as one of the measurement operators in the complete set $\{M_m\}$, e.g. $M_1 \propto R_n$. The remaining measurement operators $\{M_m\}$ $(m \neq 1)$ in the complete set can be chosen arbitrarily as long as all the measurement operators form a complete set $\{M_m\}$. When the measurement on the environment is performed,

the system of interest has a certain probability to collapse into the state represented by $K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger$ (K_n is invertible), Then the weak measurement will be performed on this state. The measurement result represented by M_1 can be used to recover to the initial state. Of course, the other measurement results by $\{M_m\}$ ($m \neq 1$) will be discarded.

More systematically, we can implement our new "environment-assisted error correction with weak measurement reversal" (EA-WMR) scheme as follows: First, we send an unknown initial state $\rho(0)$ into a noisy channel. After a period of time t, we make a measurement on the environment of the channel. For each measurement outcome "n", the state of the system correspondingly collapses into the state $K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger$. If K_n is invertible, then a WMR operation $R_n = K_n^{-1}$ may be used to restore the initial state as $R_nK_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger R_n^\dagger = \rho(0)$. In the WMR operation, we perform a weak measurement $\{M_m\}$, satisfying the conditions imposed in the previous paragraph, on the collapsed state $K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger$. Then, the initial state can be restored with certain probability. Note that if K_n is singular (non-invertible) or the weak measurement does not yield the desirable result even if K_n is invertible, then the whole process has to be repeated. The procedure is explicitly described in Fig. 1. The differences between our new scheme and the previous schemes are illustrated in table I.

Procedure	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
EAEC	Sending the state to channel	Measurement on environment	Restoration (unitary)
WMR[1]	Weak measurement	Sending the state to channel	Restoration (WM)
EA-WMR	Sending the state to channel	Measurement on environment	Restoration (WM)

Table I. Differences among EAEC, WMR, and EA-WMR. [1]There are many WMR schemes, the one listed in the table mainly describe a typical scheme discussed in Ref. [13].

Unlike the original EAEC scheme, which is deterministic, our new scheme is essentially a probabilistic process arising from the measurement on the environment and the weak measurement reversal operation. For the measurement on the environment, the probability of finding the nth outcome is given by,

$$P_{1n} = \mathrm{tr}[K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger]. \tag{6}$$

In order to compute the successful probability of the subsequent reversal operation R_n, we need to use the normalized operator

$$R_n' = N_nR_n, \tag{7}$$

instead of R_n, where N_n is given by

$$N_n = \min\{\sqrt{\lambda_i}, i = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}, \tag{8}$$

where λ_i are the eigenvalues of the matrix $K_nK_n^\dagger$. Note that physically R_n and R_n' represent the same operation, while the normalization requirement purely arises from the mathematical convention that the total probability is 1 as shown in Eq. (3). Therefore, the operators R_n' will be used when we compute the probability. For an environment-measurement outcome "n", the successful probability for the subsequent reversal operation is given by

$$P_{2n} = \frac{\mathrm{tr}[R_n'K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger R_n'^\dagger]}{\mathrm{tr}[K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger]}. \tag{9}$$



Figure 1. (Color online) Sketch of the EA-WMR scheme.

Then, the final successful probability for our new scheme is [29]

$$P_{EW} = \sum_n P_{1n}P_{2n} = \mathrm{tr}[R_n'K_n\rho(0)K_n^\dagger R_n'^\dagger] = \sum_n N_n^2. \tag{10}$$

Now, it is clear that the successful probability of recovering the initial state crucially depends on the Kraus de-

composition. Therefore, it is interesting to consider how to improve the probability by choosing a "better" Kraus decomposition. The optimization of the Kraus decomposition will be discussed in Sec. V. Before that, we will compare our new scheme with the WMR scheme in a dissipative model.

IV. SUCCESSFUL PROBABILITY FOR WMR AND EA-WMR FOR TWO QUBITS: DISSIPATIVE MODEL

First, let us point out that the original EAEC can not be applied to the dissipative model due to the absence of a viable RU decomposition. In the following example, we consider two qubits coupled to two individual baths at zero temperature ($T = 0$), in order to make a comparison to Ref. [13], where it is shown that the weak measurement reversal can be used to recover the initial state in a probabilistic manner. It should be noted that the finite temperature case can be treated in a similar manner [32]. Now we compare the newly designed EA-WMR scheme with the WMR scheme. For the two-qubit dissipative model, the Kraus operators are given by,

$$\rho(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} K_i \rho(0) K_i^\dagger, \tag{11}$$

where the Kraus operators K_i can be explicitly written as [7],

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_A & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_B & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

$$K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_A & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \omega_B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

$$K_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \omega_A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_B & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

$$K_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \omega_A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \omega_B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

where $\gamma_A(t)$ and $\gamma_B(t)$ are two functions describing the decay process (details can be found in Refs. [7, 30, 31]). Given $\gamma_A(t)$ and $\gamma_B(t)$, $\omega_A(t)$ and $\omega_B(t)$ can be determined as $\omega_A(t) = \sqrt{1-\gamma_A^2}$, $\omega_B(t) = \sqrt{1-\gamma_B^2}$. Note that our scheme is applicable to arbitrary quantum channels. For example, in the finite temperature case [32], there exists two invertible Kraus operators, thus allowing our scheme to be pertinent. In the scheme implemented by Kim's group ($T = 0$) [13], the successful probability of restoring the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ is

$$P_{WM} = \gamma_A^2\gamma_B^2\bar{p}_1\bar{p}_2[1 + |\beta|^2(\bar{p}_2\omega_B^2 + \bar{p}_1\omega_A^2 + \bar{p}_1\bar{p}_2\omega_A^2\omega_B^2)]. \tag{16}$$

where $\bar{p}_1$ and $\bar{p}_2$ represent the measurement strengths of the weak measurement before sending the state into the dissipative channel.

On the other hand, in our EA-WMR scheme, given the four Kraus operators in Eq. (12-15), it is clear that only K_1 is invertible, while other Kraus operators are singular. The smallest eigenvalue of $K_1K_1^\dagger$ is $\gamma_A^2\gamma_B^2$, so that

$$N_1 = \gamma_A\gamma_B,\ N_i = 0\ (i = 2, 3, 4). \tag{17}$$

The final probability is

$$P_{EW} = \gamma_A^2\gamma_B^2. \tag{18}$$

If we define a ratio as $\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}}$, it is straightforward to obtain

$$\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}} = \bar{p}_1\bar{p}_2[1 + |\beta|^2(\bar{p}_2\omega_B^2 + \bar{p}_1\omega_A^2 + \bar{p}_1\bar{p}_2\omega_A^2\omega_B^2)]. \tag{19}$$

For the short-time limit, and assuming the symmetric case, $\omega_A^2 = \omega_B^2 \approx 0$, we always have

$$\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}} \ll 1, \tag{20}$$

since $\bar{p}_1$ and $\bar{p}_2$ must be chosen close to zero to ensure high fidelity [13].

For the long-time limit, $\omega_A^2 = \omega_B^2 \approx 1$, we also have

$$\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}} \ll 1, \tag{21}$$

since every term in the ratio is at least a second order function of $\bar{p}_1$ and $\bar{p}_2$. If $\bar{p}_1$ and $\bar{p}_2$ are small, the ratio must be greatly smaller than 1. The detailed discussion is given in our numerical simulation. The numerical result in Fig. 2 confirms the theoretical analyzation above. In Fig. 2, the ratio $\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}}$ is always less than one for an arbitrary initial state at any point in time.

Finally, it is worth noting that the EA-WMR always give unit fidelity. The fidelity of WMR scheme is highly dependent on the choice of measurement strength p_1 and p_2. In general, the fidelity can be close to 1, but it can never reach 1. However, we should mention that the WMR has used less information (resource) than the scheme proposed here. Clearly, the enhanced successful probability and fidelity of the EA-WMR is due to the additional information obtained from the environment measurement.

V. OPTIMIZATION OF MEASUREMENT BASIS

As it is shown in Eq. (10) and Eq. (8), the successful probability of the newly proposed EA-WMR scheme depends on the choice of the Kraus decomposition. In the example shown in the last section, only one Kraus operator is non-singular (invertible), which means only one



Figure 2. (Color online) The ratio $\frac{P_{WM}}{P_{EW}}$ at different times t with different initial states $(1 \geq \alpha \geq 0)$. The initial states are given by $|\psi(0)\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$. It is clear that this ratio is always smaller than 1, which means that the environment-assisted error correction scheme always give a higher successful probability.

of the trajectories can be restored to the initial state, and the other outcomes from the measurement of the environment must be discarded. Therefore, it is of interest to consider how to choose the Kraus decomposition to maximize the the successful probability. In general this optimization issue can be very complex. However, in what follows, we will try to use a simple model to exemplify how to approach this interesting problem.

To begin with, we consider a simple model consisting of one qubit in the dissipative channel. There is a well-known Kraus decomposition for this model as [3, 30, 31]

$$\rho(t) = K_1\rho(0)K_1^\dagger + K_2\rho(0)K_2^\dagger, \tag{22}$$

where

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \; K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \omega(t) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

But the Kraus decomposition is not unique. In fact, any linear combination of $K_1$and K_2 in the following form will also be a valid set of Kraus operators:

$$L_n = \textstyle\sum_m V_{nm}K_m. \tag{24}$$

where V_{nm} is a unitary matrix. In general, an arbitrary two by two unitary matrix can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{i(\alpha-\beta-\gamma)}\cos\delta & -e^{i(\alpha-\beta+\gamma)}\sin\delta \\ e^{i(\alpha+\beta-\gamma)}\sin\delta & e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma)}\cos\delta \end{bmatrix} \\ &= e^{i\alpha}\begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\beta} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \cos\delta & -\sin\delta \\ \sin\delta & \cos\delta \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

However, we could prove that the final successful probability only depends on the parameter δ of the transformation matrix V. According to Eq. (10), since the probability only depends on the eigenvalues of $L_nL_n^\dagger$, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} L_1L_1^\dagger = &|V_{11}|^2K_1K_1^\dagger + |V_{12}|^2K_2K_2^\dagger \\ &+V_{11}V_{12}^*K_1K_2^\dagger + V_{12}V_{11}^*K_2K_1^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Solving the Secular equation $|L_1L_1^\dagger - \lambda I| = 0$, we will find the phase factors α, β, γ are all canceled, where only the parameter δ survives. Therefore, we only need to consider the single-parameter transformation matrix

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\delta & -\sin\delta \\ \sin\delta & \cos\delta \end{bmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

We have performed extensive numerical summations to test unitary transformations. The result is plotted in Fig. 3. From the figure, we find the highest successful probability appears at $\delta = n\pi/2$, where n is an integer. Interestingly, it turns out that the choice (23) actually gives the highest successful probability. Notably, the measurement basis for the original Kraus decomposition (23) is also a natural one. In this decomposition, we only need to perform the parity measurement [33, 34] to distinguish two possible trajectories $K_1\rho(0)K_1^\dagger$ and $K_2\rho(0)K_2^\dagger$.



Figure 3. (Color online) Successful probability for all the possible Kraus decompositions. The parameter δ is in the unit of radians.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed a new scheme to recover quantum states decohered by a noisy environment. The new scheme has generalized the EAEC scheme to the cases involving non-RU decompositions and weak measurement operations. We show though a dissipative model how to use a weak measurement to restore the initial quantum state even when the Kraus operators are not of an RU type. It should be noted that the new scheme we designed is a probabilistic process, rather than a deterministic one. In addition, we illustrate the new scheme in a particular example and compare its successful probability against that of the WMR scheme. We have shown

that, with the aid of environment measurement, the successful probability can be enhanced. Finally, we also discuss the possibility of improving the successful probability by choosing different Kraus decompositions. Our future research will be focused on the application of our new schemes to multiple qubit systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank J. H. Eberly and W. T. Strunz for their useful discussions. We acknowledge grant support from DOD/AF/AFOSR No. FA9550-12-1-0001.

[1] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004).
[2] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford, New York, 2002).
[3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007).
[4] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
[5] M. Schlosshauer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 324 (2005).
[6] W. H. Zurek, S. Habib, and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1187 (1993); W. H. Zurek and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2508 (1994); J. P. Paz, S. Habib, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 488 (1993); J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett **82**, 5181 (1999).
[7] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140404 (2004); T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 140404 (2006).
[8] X. Wang, A. Miranowicz, Y. X. Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022106 (2010); J. Ma, X. Wang, C.P. Sun, and F. Nori, Phys. Rep. **509**, 89 (2011); M. Bartkowiak, A. Miranowicz, X. Wang, Y. X. Liu, W. Leoński, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 053814 (2011); W. Zhong, Z. Sun, J. Ma, X. Wang, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 022337 (2013); J. Q. You, X. Hu, and F. Nori Phys. Rev. B **72**, 144529 (2005); J. Ma, Z. Sun, X. Wang, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 062323 (2012).
[9] E. L. Hahn, Phys. Rev. **80**, 580 (1950); W.-K. Rhim, A. Pines, and J. S. Waugh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 218 (1970); L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).
[10] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 548 (1993); H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 2133 (1994); C. Ahn, A. C. Doherty, and A. J. Landahl, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042301 (2002); K. Khodjasteh and D. A. Lidar Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 180501 (2005); N. Ganesan and T. J. Tarn, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032323 (2007); S. B. Xue, R. B. Wu, W. M. Zhang, J. Zhang, C. W. Li, and T. J. Tarn, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052304 (2012); J. Zhang, Y. X. Liu, C. W. Li, T. J. Tarn, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 052308 (2009).
[11] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995); A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996); C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996); R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (1996); A. Ekert and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2585 (1996); C. M. Caves, Jour. Superconductivity, **12**, 707 (1999).
[12] M. Koashi and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2598 (1999); A. N. Korotkov and A. N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 166805 (2006); A. G. Kofman, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, Phys. Rep. **520**, 43 (2012); S. Ashhab and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062103 (2010); A. N. Korotkov, and K. Keane, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 040103(R) (2010); J.-C. Lee, Y.-C. Jeong, Y.-S. Kim, and Y.-H. Kim, Opt. Express **19**, 16309 (2011).
[13] Y.-S. Kim, J.-C. Lee, O. Kwon, and Y.-H. Kim, Nat. Phys. **8**, 117 (2012);
[14] M. Gregoratti and R. F. Werner, J. Mod. Opt. **50**, 915 (2003).
[15] B. Trendelkamp-Schroer, J. Helm, and W. T. Strunz, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 062314 (2011).
[16] L. Memarzadeh, C. Cafaro, and S. Mancini, J. Phys. A **44**, 045304 (2011).
[17] F. Buscemi, G. Chiribella, and G. M. D'Ariano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090501 (2005).
[18] F. Buscemi, Phys. Lett. A **360** 256 (2006).
[19] L. Memarzadeh, C. Macchiavello, and S. Mancini, New J. Phys. **13**, 103031 (2011).
[20] K. M. R. Audenaert and S. Scheel, New J. Phys. **10**, 023011 (2008).
[21] B. Rosgen, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 102107 (2008).
[22] P. Hayden and C. King, Quantum Inform. Comput. **5**, 156 (2005).
[23] S. Taghavi, T. A. Brun, and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042321 (2010).
[24] E. Nagali *et al.*, Int. J. Quantum Inform. **07**, 1 (2009).
[25] X. Zhao, S. R. Hedemann, and T. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022321 (2013).
[26] M. D. Choi, Linear Alg. Appl. **10**, 285 (1975).
[27] G. Lindblad, Comm. Math. Phys. **48**, 147 (1976).
[28] K. Kraus, Ann. Phys. **64**, 311 (1971).
[29] In the case that K_n is singular, the smallest eigenvalue of $K_n K_n^\dagger$ is zero. Coincidently, the probability for restoration when in that case is just zero. So, the equation cover all the possible cases including the singular case.
[30] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 165322 (2003).
[31] Y. X. Liu, Şahin K. Özdemir, A. Miranowicz, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 042308 (2004).
[32] In the case of finite temperature, two out of four kraus operators are invertible, so the scheme considered in this paper can be applied to this case. See, S.-C. Wang, Z.-W. Yu, W.-J. Zou, and X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 022318 (2014).
[33] W. N. Plick, P. M. Anisimov, J. P. Dowling, H. Lee, and G. S. Agarwal, New J. Phys. **12**, 113025 (2010).
[34] S. Haroche, M. Brune, and J.-M. Raimond, J. Mod. Opt. **54**, 2101 (2007).